UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/577,749 | 04/27/2006 | Michimasa Uematsu | 448252001300 | 2868 |

20872          7590          07/11/2008
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| STORK, KYLE R |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2178 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 07/11/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/577,749 | UEMATSU ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | KYLE R. STORK | 2178 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 April 2008_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.  2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-58_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2,5-7,9-21,24-26,28,29,32-42,45-47 and 49-58_ is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) _3,4,8,22,23,27,30,31,43,44 and 48_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _4.27.06; 4.24.08; 5.5.08_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)  **Office Action Summary**  Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20080703

## DETAILED ACTION

1.    This non-final office action is in response to the Remarks filed 14 April 2008.

2.    Claims 1-58 are pending.  Claims 1, 18-20, 32-40, and 58 are independent

claims.


      The restriction requirement mailed 21 December 2007 has been withdrawn in

view of the applicant's remarks and the clean copy of the claims filed 14 April 2008.


### *Priority*

3.    Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).


### *Information Disclosure Statement*

4.    The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 27 April 2006, 24 April

2008, and 5 May 2008 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97.

Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.


### *Drawings*

5.    The examiner accepts the drawings filed 26 April 2006.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

6.     The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

7.     Claims 1, 17-18, 20, 32, 34, 39-40, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as

being anticipated by Halahmi (US 2003/0011631, printed 16 January 2003).

As per independent claim 1, Halahmi discloses a method of rendering a page,

comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language

(Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as

it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page

in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a

user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are

being obtained)

judging whether or not acquisition of definition information which is information to

be applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by a markup

language document of the page is finished (paragraphs 0017, 0045, and 0048: Here, a

page is displayed according to the definition information of the display device.  Further,

the microbrowser may also apply a Cascading Style Sheet (CSS) to the obtained page)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to define the display of the webpage is adjustable. The text of a document is adjusted based upon obtaining an inline image)

As per dependent claim 17, Halahmi further discloses continuing to obtain operation for obtaining remaining data of the page and displaying operation for the remaining data of the page after the switching of the onscreen representation is performed (paragraph 0016).

As per independent claim 18, the applicant discloses a method of rendering a page, comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language (Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are being obtained)

judging whether or not data of a predetermined number's screenfulls against the page is obtained (Figure 2, step 5)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which

the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to

define the display of the webpage is adjustable.  The text of a document is adjusted

based upon obtaining an inline image)

As per independent claim 20, Halahmi discloses a method of rendering a page

comprising: starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup

language (Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller

portions as it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page

in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a

user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are

being obtained)

judging whether or not a predetermined user operation is performed (paragraphs

0040, 0045, and 0048: Here, a plurality of user defined preferences are applied to the

display of the portions)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from

onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which

the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to

define the display of the webpage is adjustable.  The text of a document is adjusted

based upon obtaining an inline image)

As per independent claim 32, Halahmi discloses a method of rendering a page,

comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language
(Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as
it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page
in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a
user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are
being obtained)

judging whether or not acquisition of the whole data page is completed (Figure 2,
step 5)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from
onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which
the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to
define the display of the webpage is adjustable. The text of a document is adjusted
based upon obtaining an inline image)

As per independent claim 34, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those
in claim 1. Claim 34 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 39, Halahmi discloses a method of rendering a page
comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language
(paragraph 0016)

performing operation in a first browsing mode which makes less rich presentation on a screen than a second browsing mode in which an external style sheet and an external script in the page are applied (paragraphs 0016 and 0052)

judging whether or not acquisition of the whole data of the page is completed (paragraph 0016)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in the first browsing mode to onscreen representation in the second browsing mode (paragraphs 0017 and 0053)

As per independent claim 40, the applicant discloses the system for execution of the method of claim 1. Claim 40 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 57, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claim 57 is similarly rejected.


### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.     The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.     This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


10.      Claims 15-16, 19, 33, 35-38, 41, 55-56, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi.

        As per dependent claim 15, Halahmi discloses the limitations similar to those in

claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi further discloses

wherein the definition information Includes at least one style sheet (paragraph 0045).

Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the style sheet is external or use of an

external script. However, the examiner takes official notice that use of style sheets,

stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known in the art at the time

of the applicant's invention, as they provided a uniform set of display instructions to all

client computers accessing a webpage associated with the style sheet at a server. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined the well known use of external style sheets with Halahmi,

since it would have allowed for a uniform set of display instructions to be provided to all

client computers accesses a web page at a server.

        As per dependent claim 16, Halahmi discloses the limitations similar to those in

claim 15, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi fails to specifically

disclose judging whether an external style sheet is contained in a page, and obtaining

the external style sheet through a network if it is judged that the designation of the

external style sheet is contained in the page. However, the examiner takes official

notice that determining whether a style sheet is contained in a page and obtaining the

style sheet via the Internet, a network, was notoriously well known in the art at the time

of the applicant's invention. Further, this provided the benefit of allowing a page creator

to create a style sheet to be stored at a server for defining the display of a page. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined the well known with Halahmi, since it would have allowed

for a server to store a style sheet defining the display of a page.

Halahmi further fails to disclose judging whether the designation of an external

script is contained in the page and obtaining the external script through the network if it

is judged that the designation of the script is contained in the page. However, the

examiner takes official notice that scripts, such as Perl and JavaScript, are often stored

within a page, thereby adding interactivity to a webpage. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined

the well known use of embedded scripts with Halahmi, since it would have allowed a

user to provide interactivity to a webpage.

As per independent claim 19, Halahmi discloses a method of rendering a page

comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language

(Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as

it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page

in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a

user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are

being obtained)

judging whether or not acquisition of definition information which is information to

be applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by a at least one

attribute (paragraphs 0018)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from

onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which

the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to

define the display of the webpage is adjustable.  The text of a document is adjusted

based upon obtaining an inline image)

Halahmi fails to disclose wherein the attribute is based on an elapsed time.

However, the examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art

at the time of the applicant's invention that displaying data after a timeout event occurs,

thereby allowing for more rapid display of data.  It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well

known with Halahmi, since it would have allowed a user to more rapidly display

requested data.

As per independent claim 33, the applicant discloses a method of rendering a

page, comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language

(Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as

it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page

in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a

user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are

being obtained)

judging whether or not data of a predetermined number's screenfulls against the

page is obtained (Figure 2, step 5)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from

onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which

the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to

define the display of the webpage is adjustable.  The text of a document is adjusted

based upon obtaining an inline image)

Halahmi further discloses wherein the definition information includes at least one

style sheet (paragraph 0045).  Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the style

sheet is external or use of an external script.  However, the examiner takes official

notice that use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously

well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, as they provided a uniform

set of display instructions to all client computers accessing a webpage associated with

the style sheet at a server.  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of external

style sheets with Halahmi, since it would have allowed for a uniform set of display

instructions to be provided to all client computers accesses a web page at a server.

As per independent claim 35, the applicant discloses a method of rendering a

page, comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language

(Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as

it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing operation in a first browsing mode which makes less rich presentation

on a screen than a second browsing mode (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a user is

able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are being

obtained)

judging whether or not acquisition of data is complete (paragraph 0016)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from

onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which

the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to

define the display of the webpage is adjustable.  The text of a document is adjusted

based upon obtaining an inline image)

Halahmi further discloses wherein the definition information includes at least one

style sheet (paragraph 0045).  Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the style

sheet is external or use of an external script.  However, the examiner takes official

notice that use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously

well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, as they provided a uniform

set of display instructions to all client computers accessing a webpage associated with

the style sheet at a server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of external

style sheets with Halahmi, since it would have allowed for a uniform set of display

instructions to be provided to all client computers accesses a web page at a server.

As per independent claim 36, the applicant discloses a method of rendering a

page, comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language

(Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as

it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page

in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a

user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are

being obtained)

judging whether or not data of a predetermined number's screenfulls against the

page is obtained (Figure 2, step 5)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from

onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in the

second browsing mode (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to define the

display of the webpage is adjustable. The text of a document is adjusted based upon

obtaining an inline image)

Halahmi further discloses wherein the definition information includes at least one style sheet (paragraph 0045). Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the style sheet is external or use of an external script. However, the examiner takes official notice that use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, as they provided a uniform set of display instructions to all client computers accessing a webpage associated with the style sheet at a server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of external style sheets with Halahmi, since it would have allowed for a uniform set of display instructions to be provided to all client computers accesses a web page at a server.

As per independent claim 37, the applicant discloses a method of rendering a page, comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language (Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are being obtained)

judging whether or not data of a predetermined number's screenfulls against the page is obtained (Figure 2, step 5)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in the second browsing mode (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to define the display of the webpage is adjustable. The text of a document is adjusted based upon obtaining an inline image)

Halahmi further discloses wherein the definition information includes at least one style sheet (paragraph 0045). Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the style sheet is external or use of an external script. However, the examiner takes official notice that use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, as they provided a uniform set of display instructions to all client computers accessing a webpage associated with the style sheet at a server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of external style sheets with Halahmi, since it would have allowed for a uniform set of display instructions to be provided to all client computers accesses a web page at a server.

Halahmi fails to disclose wherein the attribute is based on an elapsed time. However, the examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that displaying data after a timeout event occurs, thereby allowing for more rapid display of data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known with Halahmi, since it would have allowed a user to more rapidly display requested data.

As per independent claim 38, Halahmi discloses a method of rendering a page, comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language (Figure 2, step 1; paragraph 0016: Here, a document is divided into smaller portions as it obtained, thereby allowing for more rapid transmission of a page)

performing a text browsing mode operation on obtaining part of data of the page in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page (paragraphs 0016 and 0052: Here, a user is able to display an obtained portion of a web page while portions of the page are being obtained)

judging whether or not acquisition of the whole data page is completed (Figure 2, step 5)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which the definition information is applied (pages 0017 and 0053: Here, the template used to define the display of the webpage is adjustable. The text of a document is adjusted based upon obtaining an inline image)

Halahmi further discloses wherein the definition information includes at least one style sheet (paragraph 0045). Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the style sheet is external or use of an external script. However, the examiner takes official notice that use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, as they provided a uniform set of display instructions to all client computers accessing a webpage associated with

the style sheet at a server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of external style sheets with Halahmi, since it would have allowed for a uniform set of display instructions to be provided to all client computers accesses a web page at a server.

As per dependent claim 41, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 41 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 55, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 15. Claim 55 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 56, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 16. Claim 56 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 58, Halahmi discloses a method of rendering a page comprising:

starting obtaining operation for obtaining a page made by a markup language (paragraph 0016)

performing operation in a first browsing mode which makes less rich presentation on a screen than a second browsing mode in which an external style sheet and an external script in the page are applied (paragraphs 0016 and 0052)

judging whether or not acquisition of the whole data of the page is completed (paragraph 0016)

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in the first browsing mode to onscreen representation in the second browsing mode (paragraphs 0017 and 0053)

Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the acquisition of the whole data of

the page includes acquisition of an external style sheet and an external script. Halahmi

further discloses wherein the definition information includes at least one style sheet

(paragraph 0045). Halahmi fails to specifically disclose wherein the style sheet is

external or use of an external script. However, the examiner takes official notice that

use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known

in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, as they provided a uniform set of

display instructions to all client computers accessing a webpage associated with the

style sheet at a server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known use of external

style sheets with Halahmi, since it would have allowed for a uniform set of display

instructions to be provided to all client computers accesses a web page at a server.


11.     Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 42, 45-47, and 49 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi, and further in view of Sai (US

2004/0085331, filed 17 April 2003).

As per independent claim 2, Halahmi discloses the limitations similar to those in

claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi fails to disclose where

a predetermined user operation includes operation for canceling the switching of the

onscreen representation and wherein the switching of the onscreen representation is

cancelled if it is judged by the judging that the predetermined user operation is

performed, and the switching of the onscreen representations is performed if it is judged

by the judging that the predetermined user operations is not performed. However, Si discloses wherein the predetermined user operation includes operation for canceling the switching of the onscreen representation (paragraph 0069), and wherein the switching of the onscreen representation is cancelled if it is judged by the judging that the predetermined user operation is performed, and the switching of the onscreen representation is performed if it is judged by the judging that the predetermined user operation is not performed (paragraph 0069: Here, as the switching is begun, a 'cancel' flag is set. As the switching occurs, the 'cancel' flag is monitored in order to detect a change. If a change occurs, the switching operation is cancelled. However, if no change occurs, the switch operation is performed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Si with Halahmi, since it would have allowed a user to cancel downloading and display of unwanted pages, thereby saving processing power and bandwidth for other operations.

As per dependent claim 5, Halahmi and Si disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Si further discloses wherein the operation for canceling the switching of the onscreen representation is allowed in a certain time period (paragraph 0069: Here, it is inherent that the time for canceling has to occur within a time period from the start of the switching to the end of the switching. It is not possible to cancel an operation before it has begun. Similarly, the operation can not be canceled upon its completion). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Si and

Halahmi, since it would have allowed a user to cancel downloading and display of
unwanted pages, thereby saving processing power and bandwidth for other operations.

As per dependent claim 6, Halahmi and Si disclose the limitations similar to those
in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi discloses existence
of a time between the display of data at a first time before completion of acquisition of
the definition information at a second time (paragraph 0016). Si further discloses
wherein the operation for canceling the switching of the onscreen representation is
allowed in a certain time period between a first time and a second time after the
completion of acquisition of the definition information (paragraph 0069).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
applicant's invention to have combined Si with Halahmi, since it would have allowed a
user to cancel the obtaining of data, thereby saving bandwidth to a portable device.

As per dependent claim 7, Halahmi and Si disclose the limitations similar to those
in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi discloses wherein
the onscreen representation in the text browsing mode is made during a first stage from
a start of the obtaining operation of the page to a time of completion of acquisition of
text data of the page (paragraph 0016). Si further discloses wherein the operation for
canceling the switching of the onscreen representation is allowed in a certain time
period (paragraph 0069: Here, it is inherent that the time for canceling has to occur
within a time period from the start of the switching to the end of the switching. It is not
possible to cancel an operation before it has begun. Similarly, the operation can not be
canceled upon its completion). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Si and Halahmi, since it would have allowed a user to cancel downloading and display of unwanted pages, thereby saving processing power and bandwidth for other operations.

As per dependent claim 9, Halahmi and Si disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Si further discloses wherein the operation for canceling the switching of the onscreen representation includes at least one of scrolling operation, storing operation, and printing operation (paragraph 0069: Here, the page is being printed). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Si and Halahmi, since it would have allowed for the cancellation of a printing operation.

As per dependent claim 21, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 2. Claim 21 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 24-26, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 5-7, respectively. Claims 24-26 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 9. Claim 28 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 29, Halahmi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi further discloses switching of the onscreen representation (paragraph 0016). Halahmi fails to disclose a user function to cause the switching, and as a result of the judging, the switching of the onscreen representation is performed and if the operation is not performed, the

switching of the onscreen representation is not performed. However, Si discloses a

user function to cause an operation, and as a result of the judging, the operation is

performed and, if the operation is not performed, the switching of the onscreen

representation is not performed (paragraph 0069). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Si

with Halahmi, since it would have allowed a user to affect the display of data.

 As per dependent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 2. Claim 42 is similarly rejected.

 As per dependent claims 45-47, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to

those in claims 5-7, respectively. Claims 45-47 are similarly rejected.

 As per dependent claim 49, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those

in claim 9. Claim 49 is similarly rejected.


12. Claims 10-12, 14, 50-52, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Halahmi, and further in view of Brosnahan (US 7082577, filed 23

April 2002).

 As per dependent claim 10, Halahmi discloses the limitations similar to those in

claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi fails to specifically

disclose storing information regarding a focus position and a scrolling position in the text

browsing mode and restoring the focus position and scrolling position, based on the

stored information in a mode in which the definition information is applied. However,

Brosnahan discloses storing information regarding a focus position and a scrolling

position in the text browsing mode and restoring the focus position and scrolling

position, based on the stored information in a mode in which the definition information is

applied (Figures 8-9; column 5, line 9- column 6, line 12).  It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have

combined Brosnahan and Halahmi, since it would have allowed for display of focus data

to be visually emphasized.

As per dependent claim 11, Halahmi and Brosnahan disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.  Brosnahan

further discloses judging whether or not the focus position is within a display area

defined by the scrolling position and adjusting the focus position so that the focus

position is within the display area if it is judged that the focus position is not within the

display area (Figures 8-9; column 5, line 9- column 6, line 12).  It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have

combined Brosnahan with Halahmi, since it would have allowed for display of focus data

to be visually emphasized.

As per dependent claim 12, Halahmi and Brosnahan disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.  Halahmi

discloses wherein the scrolling amount is minimized (paragraph 0016: Here, the

obtained page is segmented to appropriately display the data according to the

capabilities of a display device).  Brosnahan discloses wherein the focus target is

display appropriately (column 2, lines 17-29: Here, the focus area is highlighted).  It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Brosnahan with Halahmi, since it would have allowed a user to view focus text within a display area.

As per dependent claim 14, Halahmi and Brosnahan disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi discloses wherein the onscreen representation in the text browsing mode and the onscreen representation in which the definition information is applied are made based on a same document described by a markup language page (paragraph 0016). Brosnahan further discloses wherein the information regarding the focus position and the scrolling position is stored in association with the same document (Figures 8-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Halahmi and Brosnahan, since it would have allowed a user to apply stored focus information to a document over several browsing sessions.

As per dependent claims 50-52, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claims 10-12. Claims 50-52 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 54, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 14. Claim 54 is similarly rejected.


13.    Claims 13 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi and Brosnahan and further in view of Chang et al. (US 2002/0010707, published 24 January 2002, hereafter Chang).

As per dependent claim 13, Halahmi and Brosnahan disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halahmi fails

to specifically disclose wherein the restoring the focus position and the scrolling position is performed so that an item adjacent to the focus position to be restored is used as a focus target in the mode. However, Chang discloses use of relative positions to identify the location of data (paragraph 0032). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Chang with Halahmi and Brosnahan, since it would have allowed for the application of focus data based upon a relative location within a document.

As per dependent claim 53, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 13. Claim 53 is similarly rejected.

## Allowable Subject Matter

14.     Claim3-4, 8, 22-23, 27, 30-31, 43-44, and 48 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.  Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/

Kyle R Stork
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs